

any evidence to support that bald assertion nor any evidence to establish a level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made nor any evidence that would show the claimed invention as set forth in claims 1, 12, and 23 to be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Moreover, the Examiner merely reasserts that col. 13, lines 4-9, of Bertin et al. disclose a bandwidth reservation process used to reserve (partitioning) bandwidth of the link without explanation of how the teachings of the cited portion of Bertin et al. could read on the relevant portions of claims 1, 12, and 23. Thus, Applicant submits that the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention as set forth in claims 1, 12, and 23. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1, 12, and 23 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 2-11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19-22, 24-27, 30, 31, 33, and 34, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant notes that the Examiner merely reiterates the Examiner's previous rejections of such claims without addressing the specific arguments set forth by Applicant in Applicant's response to the previous Office action. Thus, Applicant submits that the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention as set forth in claims 2-11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19-22, 24-27, 30, 31, 33, and 34. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 2-11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19-22, 24-27, 30, 31, 33, and 34 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 15, 28, and 29, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant notes that the Examiner does not address the arguments raised by Applicant regarding claims 15, 28, and 29 in response to the previous Office action. Thus, Applicant submits that the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention as set forth in claims 15, 28, and 29. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 15, 28, and 29 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to claims 18 and 32 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but states that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has already provided reasons for the allowability of claim 15, from which claim 18 depends, and claim 29, from which claim 32 depends, Applicant submits that claims 18 and 32 are also in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

02/03/04

Date



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.

115 Wild Basin Road, Suite 107

Austin, Texas 78746

(512) 347-9223 (phone)

(512) 347-9224 (fax)